

THE WASHINGTON HERALD

Published Every Morning in the Year by
THE WASHINGTON HERALD COMPANY.

Publication Office:
734 FIFTEENTH STREET, NORTHWEST.

Entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1898, at
the post-office at Washington, D. C., under act of
Congress of March 3, 1879.

SCOTT C. BONE, Editor.

Telephone: Main 3308. (Private Branch Exchange.)

Subscription Rates by Carrier or Mail.
Daily and Sunday.....\$5.00 per month
Daily and Sunday.....\$5.00 per month
Daily, without Sunday.....\$4.00 per month
Daily, without Sunday.....\$4.00 per month
Sunday, without daily.....\$2.00 per year

No attention will be paid to anonymous
contributions, and no communications to
the editor will be printed except over the
name of the writer.

Manuscripts offered for publication will
be returned if unacceptable, but stamps
should be sent with the manuscript for
that purpose.

All communications intended for this
newspaper, whether for the daily or the
Sunday issue, should be addressed to
THE WASHINGTON HERALD.

New York Representative, J. C. WILBERDING
SPECIAL AGENT, Bureau Building.
Chicago Representative, BARNARD & BRAN-
HAM, Boyce Building.

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1909.

THE NATION'S CITY.

"That the Washington Herald will
stand for the best interests of Wash-
ington needs not the saying. It will
ever keep in mind, however, that this
city—and that its present greatness
and future pre-eminence have as a
basis its national character."—From
editorial foreword in the first issue of
this paper, October 8, 1906.

Will the Retailer Be the Goat?

Assuming that the people, the great
body of consumers, are taking a deep
and burning interest in all that is
transpiring at Washington, the warnings
and prophecies now given out by Gov.
Johnson, James J. Hill, and others seem
to be abundantly warranted. Certainly
the Republican party is inviting an over-
throw in the Congressional elections next
year.

But is the assumption itself that the
people are aroused over the tariff war-
ranted? Is it true? The consumers ought
to be taking a deep and burning interest
in the spectacle at the Capitol, for their
welfare is deeply involved in it; but are
they? Often we are moved to doubt it.
Frankly speaking, evidence is lacking of a
great public demand for honest tariff re-
vision. People are aroused in spots—
Iowa, for example, is said to be literally
on fire for tariff reduction—but taking
the country as a whole, it is manifesting
marked indifference, an obvious indiffer-
ence, respecting legislation vitally affect-
ing it. We do not undertake to explain
it, we simply call attention to the fact, of
what seems to us a fact.

A consistent and persistent advocate of
revision downward, this paper is con-
stantly hearing from the interests—the
selfish interests—by way of protest or
defense; but from the consumer, the
payer of the tax, rarely a word. He ap-
parently is submissive, acquiescent, long-
suffering, and reconciled to his fate.

Does any rational being really believe
that the Republican party, through the
Congress which it controls, would dare
disregard its pledges, as it is proposing
to disregard them, by raising tariff taxes
instead of lowering them, if the people
of the country, the millions of consumers,
were actually aroused as they ought to
be? No; the spectacle at the Capitol
would be quite a different thing.

There is one phase of this extraordinary
tariff development, however, that im-
presses us as likely to produce a poten-
tial factor in politics—the attempt in
Congress to shift from the trusts to the
retailers the responsibility for prevail-
ing high prices for the commodities of
life. Will the business men of the
country, the retailers, large and small,
who have been the mainstay of the party
in recent years, meekly accept that ar-
rangement? Will they submit to being
put in the role of public oppressors, that
the trusts, under the protection of an in-
iquitous tariff law, may wax the greater
and stronger? We do not believe it.

The retailer will not, in our opinion,
willingly become the goat. And if he
be, unlike the consumer, be not submis-
sive, acquiescent, long-suffering, and re-
conciled, then something may come to
pass politically such as Gov. Johnson and
Mr. Hill predict.

"Congress is very short-sighted," says
the Hartford Post. But it is a tall talker.

An Appraisal of Heroes.

It has been said so often that Ameri-
cans take their pleasures sadly that the
belief has come to be unconsciously ac-
cepted that we have too few holidays in
this land of freedom—and of industry.
But repetition does not make fact, and
the announcement that Chicago enjoys a
respite from its hustle during the equiv-
alent of eighty-nine days in the year, or
an approximate total of 25 per cent of
the twelve months, will be a surprise to
many readers. This total is made up of
Sundays, nine anniversaries, election
days, and twenty-six half-Saturdays.
The enumeration comes as a shock to the
Chicago realization of the sound if
sordid proverb that time is money.

The Wisconsin legislature comes to the
relief of such a situation with a propo-
sition to celebrate the birthdays of our
national heroes every other year. The
pending bill proposes, for example, to
honor the natal day of Lincoln in odd-
numbered years and that of Washington
in the even-numbered years.

Wisconsin is by far too conservative.
The suggestion that it makes is suscep-
tible of indefinite development. It leads
logically to an expansion of the national
Valhalla; that will not interfere with the
economic utility of time. The plan im-
plies the possibility of the most delicate
adjustment of hero worship to cold ap-
praisal of the honor due the view-
less shades of the departed great.

A chronological gradation of the most dis-
tinguished ranks of the spirit world is
made practicable. The multiplication of
ceremonial reverence could be made not
inconvenient with persistence in unemo-
tional economic progress. A birthday
could be observed not annually, but per-
haps every fifth or tenth or twentieth
year. As a nation, we could combine
periodic sentiment with almost incessant
business.

The suggestion, however, involves ob-
vious embarrassments to the living, upon
whom must devolve the apportionment
of whatever exaltation of name or preser-
vation in memory a holiday may imply.
Such a fine discrimination could be, in-
deed, a most delicate task for our Na-
tional Legislature, for you cannot find a
member of Congress who is not, at least
in his own estimation, an illustrious ex-
ample to a plurality of his constituents.

It is distinctly an instance of the en-
forced presence of the personal equation
and of the inevitable absence of the his-
torical perspective.

happens every fifth or tenth or twentieth
year. As a nation, we could combine
periodic sentiment with almost incessant
business.

The suggestion, however, involves ob-
vious embarrassments to the living, upon
whom must devolve the apportionment
of whatever exaltation of name or preser-
vation in memory a holiday may imply.
Such a fine discrimination could be, in-
deed, a most delicate task for our Na-
tional Legislature, for you cannot find a
member of Congress who is not, at least
in his own estimation, an illustrious ex-
ample to a plurality of his constituents.

It is distinctly an instance of the en-
forced presence of the personal equation
and of the inevitable absence of the his-
torical perspective.

If the Republican party falls down on
tariff revision, we fear the strain on the
postmasters to carry the next election
is going to be something fierce.

The trouble about the story that Bacon
wrote Shakespeare is that it has to be
proved all over again every year or so,
and then nobody believes it.

If the women are to be required to re-
move their hats in church, they have
the right to demand, we think, that they
be furnished two seats each.

The mysterious Austrian archduke,
Johann Orth, has been discovered again.
That gentleman comes to life about as
regularly as George Washington's last
surviving body servant passes away.

"One-way to tell that you are getting old
is when you get tired of the circus
parade before it is half over," says the
Ohio State Journal. Probably so; but we
never heard of anybody doing that.

The Wright brothers will be given the
time of their lives in Dayton, their na-
tive town. They ought to; they have
managed to get up in the world consid-
erably since their kid days.

Nobody has a good word for the fly
nowadays. He is a pest and a breeder
of disease. He has served to point many
a moral and adorn many a tale. But he
is an undesirable citizen, and he must go.

The Atlanta Constitution of Sunday last
had another one of those five-column-
wide-eighteen-point-type editorials. We
have tried to reason with the Constitution
about this thing heretofore, and we
shall have nothing further to say as to
the merits of the same. But this last
offense crowded Frank L. Stanton en-
tirely off the page, and that is right
where we file an entirely new protest.

Having chronicled the Lamb-Beefsteak
suppliants, of recent date, the Kentucky
papers now have much to say concern-
ing the forthcoming Bacon-Liver wed-
ding. These are days of combinations
and trusts, however.

A Wisconsin man wants to enact a law
against swearing, and a California re-
former wants one against kissing. One
would be quite as effective as the other,
we imagine.

"I am for revenue," says Senator Till-
man. With a little iron ore and tea pro-
tection on the side, nevertheless.

"Senator Aldrich is not an orator,"
says the Chattanooga Times. But his
eloquence is wonderfully persuasive, it
seems.

We desire to say to those outside bar-
barians who are forever and eternally
poking their noses into the affairs of
Washington's affairs that Mr. Taft does
not pronounce it "got."

The old controversy as to the actual
authorship of the so-called works of
Shakespeare never seems to wear out.
For years and years it has been raging.
No sooner is one theory exploded than
another one crops out—and always the
people apparently believe finally that it
must have been Shakespeare, after all,
who wrote the plays and poems, and that
if it were not Shakespeare, it could not
have been Francis Bacon, anyway.

Collier's of recent date carried a most
interesting and mildly instructive article
on the subject, seeking to fasten re-
sponsibility for the works on Bacon, and
the attempt to set up the contention was
made through the alleged discovery of a
hidden cipher—by far the most popular
means employed in the past. This new
cipher possesses the merit of being ex-
tremely mysterious and hard to untangle.
Try as one will to follow the instructions
laid down, it is hard to reach the con-
clusions indicated. A Connecticut con-
temporary gave it up after three or four
days of careful consideration, managing
to get the right answers in only about
50 per cent of the examples submitted for
inspection. The New York Sun takes it
in hand and manages to prove that Sir
Francis Bacon was not the man who
wrote Shakespeare's plays by the au-
thority of this new cipher, but that Theod-
ore Roosevelt undoubtedly ground them
out!

The real truth appears to us to be
that while the authorship of the works
may be in doubt, it is pretty safe to
assume that Shakespeare was the guilty
man, in the light of all the evi-
dence obtainable, if he has never been
indisputably connected with them. The
great objection to crediting Shakespeare
with the works is because he was such a
quiet, unobtrusive man, with habits
very much of the ordinary kind, ap-
parently. That a man could be that
sort, and still have produced those won-
derful things, seems inconceivable in
the ordinary mind. Surely the au-
thor of "Hamlet" must have been some
variety of freak or an eccentric person.
How could a man sound the great depths
of human nature so unerringly as Shake-
speare did and still be the Shakespeare
history has taught us to know per-
sonally? That must be the eternal ques-
tion that keeps the Shakespeare wrangle
always going and yet never getting any-
where.

This last cipher will, in all probability,
go the way of all others. Men will read
it, and some will wonder. But it will be
forgotten in a day or so, and Shakespeare
will still be Shakespeare.

Hectorated and pestered as poor Mr. Ald-
rich is, Senator Gallinger's tender solici-
tude for him is all the more touching.

The kidnapping and murder professions
have received some rather severe jolts
of late.

Jacques Futrelle has grown steadily in
favor and repute of late years as a writer
of clever fiction. His latest book, "Eli-
sive Isabel," has made a distinctly favor-
able impression on the critics, as well as

the public. In fact, he has now grown
famous enough, we think, to resume his
old-fashioned name—plain Jack Futrel.

King Edward has set the fashion of
wearing the trousers creased down the
sides. He is also responsible for that
green hat foolishness. His majesty ought
to have outgrown such things by this
time, we think.

All the Georgia papers nowadays invari-
ably speak of Atlanta as "Atlanta (Ga.)."
This, we suppose, is to counteract the
Atlanta idea that it is really "Georgia
(Atlanta)."

"American men do not make love,"
says Elmer Glyn. Does she mean that as
a slap at the sweet summer girl and her
wiles?

The Baltimore man who recently erect-
ed a monument to Adam gave the old
fellow the finest ad he has had since he
woke up one fine morning and found
one of his ribs missing.

The complaint that an income tax
would make us a nation of liars appar-
ently comes largely from people who
are afraid to trust themselves.

The trouble about the story that Bacon
wrote Shakespeare is that it has to be
proved all over again every year or so,
and then nobody believes it.

If the women are to be required to re-
move their hats in church, they have
the right to demand, we think, that they
be furnished two seats each.

The mysterious Austrian archduke,
Johann Orth, has been discovered again.
That gentleman comes to life about as
regularly as George Washington's last
surviving body servant passes away.

"One-way to tell that you are getting old
is when you get tired of the circus
parade before it is half over," says the
Ohio State Journal. Probably so; but we
never heard of anybody doing that.

The Wright brothers will be given the
time of their lives in Dayton, their na-
tive town. They ought to; they have
managed to get up in the world consid-
erably since their kid days.

Nobody has a good word for the fly
nowadays. He is a pest and a breeder
of disease. He has served to point many
a moral and adorn many a tale. But he
is an undesirable citizen, and he must go.

The Atlanta Constitution of Sunday last
had another one of those five-column-
wide-eighteen-point-type editorials. We
have tried to reason with the Constitution
about this thing heretofore, and we
shall have nothing further to say as to
the merits of the same. But this last
offense crowded Frank L. Stanton en-
tirely off the page, and that is right
where we file an entirely new protest.

Having chronicled the Lamb-Beefsteak
suppliants, of recent date, the Kentucky
papers now have much to say concern-
ing the forthcoming Bacon-Liver wed-
ding. These are days of combinations
and trusts, however.

A Wisconsin man wants to enact a law
against swearing, and a California re-
former wants one against kissing. One
would be quite as effective as the other,
we imagine.

"I am for revenue," says Senator Till-
man. With a little iron ore and tea pro-
tection on the side, nevertheless.

"Senator Aldrich is not an orator,"
says the Chattanooga Times. But his
eloquence is wonderfully persuasive, it
seems.

We desire to say to those outside bar-
barians who are forever and eternally
poking their noses into the affairs of
Washington's affairs that Mr. Taft does
not pronounce it "got."

The old controversy as to the actual
authorship of the so-called works of
Shakespeare never seems to wear out.
For years and years it has been raging.
No sooner is one theory exploded than
another one crops out—and always the
people apparently believe finally that it
must have been Shakespeare, after all,
who wrote the plays and poems, and that
if it were not Shakespeare, it could not
have been Francis Bacon, anyway.

Collier's of recent date carried a most
interesting and mildly instructive article
on the subject, seeking to fasten re-
sponsibility for the works on Bacon, and
the attempt to set up the contention was
made through the alleged discovery of a
hidden cipher—by far the most popular
means employed in the past. This new
cipher possesses the merit of being ex-
tremely mysterious and hard to untangle.
Try as one will to follow the instructions
laid down, it is hard to reach the con-
clusions indicated. A Connecticut con-
temporary gave it up after three or four
days of careful consideration, managing
to get the right answers in only about
50 per cent of the examples submitted for
inspection. The New York Sun takes it
in hand and manages to prove that Sir
Francis Bacon was not the man who
wrote Shakespeare's plays by the au-
thority of this new cipher, but that Theod-
ore Roosevelt undoubtedly ground them
out!

The real truth appears to us to be
that while the authorship of the works
may be in doubt, it is pretty safe to
assume that Shakespeare was the guilty
man, in the light of all the evi-
dence obtainable, if he has never been
indisputably connected with them. The
great objection to crediting Shakespeare
with the works is because he was such a
quiet, unobtrusive man, with habits
very much of the ordinary kind, ap-
parently. That a man could be that
sort, and still have produced those won-
derful things, seems inconceivable in
the ordinary mind. Surely the au-
thor of "Hamlet" must have been some
variety of freak or an eccentric person.
How could a man sound the great depths
of human nature so unerringly as Shake-
speare did and still be the Shakespeare
history has taught us to know per-
sonally? That must be the eternal ques-
tion that keeps the Shakespeare wrangle
always going and yet never getting any-
where.

This last cipher will, in all probability,
go the way of all others. Men will read
it, and some will wonder. But it will be
forgotten in a day or so, and Shakespeare
will still be Shakespeare.

Hectorated and pestered as poor Mr. Ald-
rich is, Senator Gallinger's tender solici-
tude for him is all the more touching.

The kidnapping and murder professions
have received some rather severe jolts
of late.

Jacques Futrelle has grown steadily in
favor and repute of late years as a writer
of clever fiction. His latest book, "Eli-
sive Isabel," has made a distinctly favor-
able impression on the critics, as well as

the public. In fact, he has now grown
famous enough, we think, to resume his
old-fashioned name—plain Jack Futrel.

King Edward has set the fashion of
wearing the trousers creased down the
sides. He is also responsible for that
green hat foolishness. His majesty ought
to have outgrown such things by this
time, we think.

All the Georgia papers nowadays invari-
ably speak of Atlanta as "Atlanta (Ga.)."
This, we suppose, is to counteract the
Atlanta idea that it is really "Georgia
(Atlanta)."

"American men do not make love,"
says Elmer Glyn. Does she mean that as
a slap at the sweet summer girl and her
wiles?

The Baltimore man who recently erect-
ed a monument to Adam gave the old
fellow the finest ad he has had since he
woke up one fine morning and found
one of his ribs missing.

The complaint that an income tax
would make us a nation of liars appar-
ently comes largely from people who
are afraid to trust themselves.

The trouble about the story that Bacon
wrote Shakespeare is that it has to be
proved all over again every year or so,
and then nobody believes it.

If the women are to be required to re-
move their hats in church, they have
the right to demand, we think, that they
be furnished two seats each.

The mysterious Austrian archduke,
Johann Orth, has been discovered again.
That gentleman comes to life about as
regularly as George Washington's last
surviving body servant passes away.

"One-way to tell that you are getting old
is when you get tired of the circus
parade before it is half over," says the
Ohio State Journal. Probably so; but we
never heard of anybody doing that.

The Wright brothers will be given the
time of their lives in Dayton, their na-
tive town. They ought to; they have
managed to get up in the world consid-
erably since their kid days.

Nobody has a good word for the fly
nowadays. He is a pest and a breeder
of disease. He has served to point many
a moral and adorn many a tale. But he
is an undesirable citizen, and he must go.

The Atlanta Constitution of Sunday last
had another one of those five-column-
wide-eighteen-point-type editorials. We
have tried to reason with the Constitution
about this thing heretofore, and we
shall have nothing further to say as to
the merits of the same. But this last
offense crowded Frank L. Stanton en-
tirely off the page, and that is right
where we file an entirely new protest.

Having chronicled the Lamb-Beefsteak
suppliants, of recent date, the Kentucky
papers now have much to say concern-
ing the forthcoming Bacon-Liver wed-
ding. These are days of combinations
and trusts, however.

A Wisconsin man wants to enact a law
against swearing, and a California re-
former wants one against kissing. One
would be quite as effective as the other,
we imagine.

"I am for revenue," says Senator Till-
man. With a little iron ore and tea pro-
tection on the side, nevertheless.

"Senator Aldrich is not an orator,"
says the Chattanooga Times. But his
eloquence is wonderfully persuasive, it
seems.

We desire to say to those outside bar-
barians who are forever and eternally
poking their noses into the affairs of
Washington's affairs that Mr. Taft does
not pronounce it "got."

The old controversy as to the actual
authorship of the so-called works of
Shakespeare never seems to wear out.
For years and years it has been raging.
No sooner is one theory exploded than
another one crops out—and always the
people apparently believe finally that it
must have been Shakespeare, after all,
who wrote the plays and poems, and that
if it were not Shakespeare, it could not
have been Francis Bacon, anyway.

Collier's of recent date carried a most
interesting and mildly instructive article
on the subject, seeking to fasten re-
sponsibility for the works on Bacon, and
the attempt to set up the contention was
made through the alleged discovery of a
hidden cipher—by far the most popular
means employed in the past. This new
cipher possesses the merit of being ex-
tremely mysterious and hard to untangle.
Try as one will to follow the instructions
laid down, it is hard to reach the con-
clusions indicated. A Connecticut con-
temporary gave it up after three or four
days of careful consideration, managing
to get the right answers in only about
50 per cent of the examples submitted for
inspection. The New York Sun takes it
in hand and manages to prove that Sir
Francis Bacon was not the man who
wrote Shakespeare's plays by the au-
thority of this new cipher, but that Theod-
ore Roosevelt undoubtedly ground them
out!

The real truth appears to us to be
that while the authorship of the works
may be in doubt, it is pretty safe to
assume that Shakespeare was the guilty
man, in the light of all the evi-
dence obtainable, if he has never been
indisputably connected with them. The
great objection to crediting Shakespeare
with the works is because he was such a
quiet, unobtrusive man, with habits
very much of the ordinary kind, ap-
parently. That a man could be that
sort, and still have produced those won-
derful things, seems inconceivable in
the ordinary mind. Surely the au-
thor of "Hamlet" must have been some
variety of freak or an eccentric person.
How could a man sound the great depths
of human nature so unerringly as Shake-
speare did and still be the Shakespeare
history has taught us to know per-
sonally? That must be the eternal ques-
tion that keeps the Shakespeare wrangle
always going and yet never getting any-
where.

This last cipher will, in all probability,
go the way of all others. Men will read
it, and some will wonder. But it will be
forgotten in a day or so, and Shakespeare
will still be Shakespeare.

Hectorated and pestered as poor Mr. Ald-
rich is, Senator Gallinger's tender solici-
tude for him is all the more touching.

The kidnapping and murder professions
have received some rather severe jolts
of late.

Jacques Futrelle has grown steadily in
favor and repute of late years as a writer
of clever fiction. His latest book, "Eli-
sive Isabel," has made a distinctly favor-
able impression on the critics, as well as

the public. In fact, he has now grown
famous enough, we think, to resume his
old-fashioned name—plain Jack Futrel.

King Edward has set the fashion of
wearing the trousers creased down the
sides. He is also responsible for that
green hat foolishness. His majesty ought
to have outgrown such things by this
time, we think.

All the Georgia papers nowadays invari-
ably speak of Atlanta as "Atlanta (Ga.)."
This, we suppose, is to counteract the
Atlanta idea that it is really "Georgia
(Atlanta)."

"American men do not make love,"
says Elmer Glyn. Does she mean that as
a slap at the sweet summer girl and her
wiles?

The Baltimore man who recently erect-
ed a monument to Adam gave the old
fellow the finest ad he has had since he
woke up one fine morning and found
one of his ribs missing.

The complaint that an income tax
would make us a nation of liars appar-
ently comes largely from people who
are afraid to trust themselves.

The trouble about the story that Bacon
wrote Shakespeare is that it has to be
proved all over again every year or so,
and then nobody believes it.

If the women are to be required to re-
move their hats in church, they have
the right to demand, we think, that they
be furnished two seats each.

The mysterious Austrian archduke,
Johann Orth, has been discovered again.
That gentleman comes to life about as
regularly as George Washington's last
surviving body servant passes away.

"One-way to tell that you are getting old
is when you get tired of the circus
parade before it is half over," says the
Ohio State Journal. Probably so; but we
never heard of anybody doing that.

The Wright brothers will be given the
time of their lives in Dayton, their na-
tive town. They ought to; they have
managed to get up in the world consid-
erably since their kid days.

Nobody has a good word for the fly
nowadays. He is a pest and a breeder
of disease. He has served to point many
a moral and adorn many a tale. But he
is an undesirable citizen, and he must go.

The Atlanta Constitution of Sunday last
had another one of those five-column-
wide-eighteen-point-type editorials. We
have tried to reason with the Constitution
about this thing heretofore, and we
shall have nothing further to say as to
the merits of the same. But this last
offense crowded Frank L. Stanton en-
tirely off the page, and that is right
where we file an entirely new protest.

Having chronicled the Lamb-Beefsteak
suppliants, of recent date, the Kentucky
papers now have much to say concern-
ing the forthcoming Bacon-Liver wed-
ding. These are days of combinations
and trusts, however.

A Wisconsin man wants to enact a law
against swearing, and a California re-
former wants one against kissing. One
would be quite as effective as the other,
we imagine.

"I am for revenue," says Senator Till-
man. With a little iron ore and tea pro-
tection on the side, nevertheless.

"Senator Aldrich is not an orator,"
says the Chattanooga Times. But his
eloquence is wonderfully persuasive, it
seems.

We desire to say to those outside bar-
barians who are forever and eternally
poking their noses into the affairs of
Washington's affairs that Mr. Taft does
not pronounce it "got."

The old controversy as to the actual
authorship of the so-called works of
Shakespeare never seems to wear out.
For years and years it has been raging.
No sooner is one theory exploded than
another one crops out—and always the
people apparently believe finally that it
must have been Shakespeare, after all,
who wrote the plays and poems, and that
if it were not Shakespeare, it could not
have been Francis Bacon, anyway.

Collier's of recent date carried a most
interesting and mildly instructive article
on the subject, seeking to fasten re-
sponsibility for the works on Bacon, and
the attempt to set up the contention was
made through the alleged discovery of a
hidden cipher—by far the most popular
means employed in the past. This new
cipher possesses the merit of being ex-
tremely mysterious and hard to untangle.
Try as one will to follow the instructions
laid down, it is hard to reach the con-
clusions indicated. A Connecticut con-
temporary gave it up after three or four
days of careful consideration, managing
to get the right answers in only about
50 per cent of the examples submitted for
inspection. The New York Sun takes it
in hand and manages to prove that Sir
Francis Bacon was not the man who
wrote Shakespeare's plays by the au-
thority of this new cipher, but that Theod-
ore Roosevelt undoubtedly ground them
out!

The real truth appears to us to be
that while the authorship of the works
may be in doubt, it is pretty safe to
assume that Shakespeare was the guilty
man, in the light of all the evi-
dence obtainable, if he has never been
indisputably connected with them. The
great objection to crediting Shakespeare
with the works is because he was such a
quiet, unobtrusive man, with habits
very much of the ordinary kind, ap-
parently. That a man could be that
sort, and still have produced those won-
derful things, seems inconceivable in
the ordinary mind. Surely the au-
thor of "Hamlet" must have been some
variety of freak or an eccentric person.
How could a man sound the great depths
of human nature so unerringly as Shake-
speare did and still be the Shakespeare
history has taught us to know per-
sonally? That must be the eternal ques-
tion that keeps the Shakespeare wrangle
always going and yet never getting any-
where.

This last cipher will, in all probability,
go the way of all others. Men will read
it, and some will wonder. But it will be
forgotten in a day or so, and Shakespeare
will still be Shakespeare.

Hectorated and pestered as poor Mr. Ald-
rich is, Senator Gallinger's tender solici-